

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This reply is responsive to an Office Action mailed on May 2, 2007. Reconsideration and allowance of the application and presently pending claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, and 34 are respectfully requested.

Present Status of the Patent Application

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, and 34 remain pending in the present application. Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, 33, and 34 have been rejected. Claims 4-8, 10, 14-18, 20, 24-28, 30, and 32 have been withdrawn due to restriction requirement. Claims 2, 9, 12, 19, 29, and 33 have been cancelled without prejudice. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 31 have been amended.

Summary of the Invention

The claims of the present invention are drawn to a furniture construction that allows the user to have access to the back of an electronic component when a drawer containing the electronic component is extended and to easily view the front of the electronic component when the drawer is retracted. The novel features that allow this are at least one roller mounted on the housing near an angled opening of the housing, a stop forming a part of the interior of the housing adjacent to the angled opening, and the drawer including a top portion for engaging the stop to limit the movement of the drawer. Neither the Stringfellow patent nor the Price patent discloses any of these features.

Response to the Drawing Objections

The drawings stand objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(5)(p) because they allegedly do not include reference sign 32 mentioned in the description.

Applicant would like to respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to FIG. 1. On the right side of FIG. 1 substantially midway between reference signs 16 and 17, Examiner will find reference sign 32. Therefore, this drawing objection should be withdrawn.

Furthermore, the drawings stand objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a) due to the lack of showing a motor as specified in the claims. Claim 33 has been cancelled rendering this objection moot. Therefore, this drawing objection should be withdrawn.

Response to the Claim Objections

Claims 21-23 stand objected to because of informalities. Applicant has amended the claims as suggested by the Examiner. Therefore, this objection should be withdrawn.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §112

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as allegedly being indefinite to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Applicant has amended the claims to clarify that the claims are intend to be drawn to a furniture construction/support assembly, not a combination with an electronic component and/or a plurality of media packages. Therefore, this rejection should be withdrawn.

Response to Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 1, 3, 11, 13, and 21-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stringfellow et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,456,468) in view of Price, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,199,773). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

Claims 31 and 33-34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Stringfellow in view of Price and Park (U.S. Patent No. 5,797,666). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

The claimed invention enables an electronic component to be mounted within a furniture construction in an angled position for convenient viewing by the user when the component is in use. When it is desired to remove the component or otherwise adjust or re-cable it, a drawer supports the component in a downwardly inclined position during use and is moveable to a "generally horizontal (position) and disposed extending at least partially through the (angled) opening." In this extended position of the drawer, access can be gained conveniently to the electronic component.

None of the cited prior art references disclose, nor suggest, such an arrangement. None of the cited prior art is capable of the claimed technique of using stops and rollers mounted on the furniture housing to enable a drawer to be moved from "a downwardly inclined angle" to a "generally horizontal (position) and disposed extending at least partially through the (angled) opening."

The distinguishing language of the claims will now be considered.

Independent Claim 1

Independent claim 1, as amended, is allowable for at least the reason that Stringfellow and Price do not disclose, teach, or suggest any of the following:

- 1) "at least one roller mounted on the housing near the angled opening to enable the drawer to move singularly through the opening until the drawer pivots under its weight into a substantially horizontal position",

- 2) "a stop forming a part of the interior of the housing adjacent to the angled opening", and
- 3) "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the stop to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position"

1) *"at least one roller mounted on the housing near the angled opening to enable the drawer to move singularly through the opening until the drawer pivots under its weight into a substantially horizontal position"*

Stringfellow and Price do not teach, suggest, or disclose "at least one roller mounted on the housing near the angled opening to enable the drawer to move singularly through the opening until the drawer pivots under its weight into a substantially horizontal position." Stringfellow merely discloses a pair of stationary support plates 42 and 44, and a monitor 6 having lugs 36, 38, and 40 extending from casing 20. Stringfellow does **not** disclose "at least one roller." Price merely discloses that "[a] roller 76 is mounted for rotation on a shaft 78, FIG. 3, secured to each support brackets 72 and 74 for rolling movement over the glide means 40, 42, 48, and 50" at col. 3, lines 14-17. None of the rollers of Price are "mounted on the housing". Furthermore, the support means of Price would not be combined with the Stringfellow device, because the inventive feature of Stringfellow, a pair of identical support plates and a video monitor with corresponding lugs, makes the rollers and glide means of Price unnecessary. Therefore, Stringfellow and Price do not disclose "at least one roller mounted on the housing near the angled opening to enable the drawer to move singularly through the opening until the drawer pivots under its weight into a substantially horizontal position."

2) *"a stop forming a part of the interior of the housing adjacent to the angled opening"*

Stringfellow and Price do not teach, suggest, or disclose "a stop forming a part of the interior of the housing adjacent to the angled opening." Stringfellow merely

discloses the monitor 6 stopping when the lugs 38 and 40 come to the end of tracks 48 and 50, respectively. Similarly, Price merely discloses the stopping the monitor 86 when the rollers 76 come to the end of glide means 40, 42, 48, and 50. Neither Stringfellow nor Price discloses a stop associated with any part of the interiors of their respective housings. Therefore, Stringfellow and Price do not disclose "a stop forming a part of the interior of the housing adjacent to the angled opening."

3) *"the drawer including a top portion for engaging the stop to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position"*

Stringfellow and Price do not teach, suggest, or disclose "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the stop to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position." Once again, Stringfellow merely discloses a pair of stationary support plates 42 and 44, not a movable drawer. Price discloses support means 60, but the support means 60 does not include "a top portion for engaging the stop." In fact, the support means 60 does not come in contact with any part of the top of the Price work station. Therefore, Stringfellow and Price do not disclose "the drawer including a top portion for engaging the stop to limit the movement of the drawer in the horizontal access position."

Accordingly, the rejection is deficient in these areas. Notwithstanding, the undersigned has reviewed the entirety of the Stringfellow and Price patents and has failed to identify any such teachings anywhere within these references. Accordingly, the Stringfellow and Price patents fail to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 1, and the rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 11

Independent claim 11 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1. Accordingly, the Stringfellow and Price patents fail to teach or

disclose the invention as defined by claim 11, and the rejection of claim 11 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 21

Independent claim 21 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1. Accordingly, the Stringfellow and Price patents fail to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 21, and the rejection of claim 21 should be withdrawn.

Independent Claim 31

Independent claim 31 is allowable for at least the reasons described above regarding claim 1. The Park patent does not resolve the deficiencies of the Stringfellow and Price patents. Accordingly, the Stringfellow, Price and Park patents fail to teach or disclose the invention as defined by claim 31, and the rejection of claim 31 should be withdrawn.

Dependent Claims

Dependent claims 3, 13, 22-23, and 34 are believed to be allowable for at least the reason that these claims depend from allowable independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 31, respectively. *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 U.S.P.Q.2d 1596, 1600 (Fed. Cir. 1988).

CONCLUSION

The other cited art of record has been reviewed, and it is believed that the claims, as amended, patentably distinguish thereover.

In light of the foregoing amendments and for at least the reasons set forth above, Applicant respectfully submits that all objections and rejections have been traversed, rendered moot, and/or accommodated, and that now pending claims 1, 3, 11, 13, 21-23, 31, and 34 are in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and allowance

of the present application and all pending claims are hereby courteously requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at 619-209-3063.


Please direct all correspondence to the undersigned attorney at the address indicated below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

DUCKOR SPRADLING METZGER & WYNNE
A Law Corporation
3043 4th Avenue
San Diego, California 92103-5801

Telephone No.: 619.209.3000
Facsimile No.: 619.209.3043
Email Address: kleinke@dsmwlaw.com

By: 
Bernard L. Kleinke
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No. 22,123